

Review report of a final thesis

Czech Technical University in Prague

Faculty of Information Technology

Student: Bc. Pavol Kušlita
Reviewer: Ing. Alexandru Moucha, Ph.D.
Thesis title: Open source WLC
Branch of the study: Computer Systems and Networks

Date: 8. 2. 2016

Evaluation criterion:		The evaluation scale: 1 to 5.	
1. Difficulty and other comments on the assignment		1 = extremely challenging assignment, 2 = rather difficult assignment, 3 = assignment of average difficulty, 4 = easier, but still sufficient assignment, 5 = insufficient assignment	
Criteria description: Characterize this final thesis in detail and its relationships to previous or current projects. Comment what is difficult about this thesis (in case of a more difficult thesis, you may overlook some shortcomings that you would not in case of an easy assignment, and on the contrary, with an easy assignment those shortcomings should be evaluated more strictly.)			
Comments: The work is simple in its construction: build a Wireless LAN Controller, however it is complicated when you want to do it properly - analysis, design, implementation and testing. What I really admire at this work is the level of quality which was built with. The student took no cutting corners and really did an excellent engineering work.			
Evaluation criterion:		The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.	
2. Fulfilment of the assignment		1 = assignment fulfilled, 2 = assignment fulfilled with minor objections, 3 = assignment fulfilled with major objections, 4 = assignment not fulfilled	
Criteria description: Assess whether the thesis meets the assignment statement. In Comments indicate parts of the assignment that have not been fulfilled, completely or partially, or extensions of the thesis beyond the original assignment. If the assignment was not completely fulfilled, try to assess the importance, impact, and possibly also the reason of the insufficiencies.			
Comments: All the requirements were fulfilled and with very good quality level.			
Evaluation criterion:		The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.	
3. Size of the main written part		1 = meets the criteria, 2 = meets the criteria with minor objections, 3 = meets the criteria with major objections, 4 = does not meet the criteria	
Criteria description: Evaluate the adequacy of the extent of the final thesis, considering its content and the size of the written part, i.e. that all parts of the thesis are rich on information and the text does not contain unnecessary parts.			
Comments: The work size corresponds to the expected size of a diploma thesis.			
Evaluation criterion:		The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).	
4. Factual and logical level of the thesis		100 (A)	
Criteria description: Assess whether the thesis is correct as to the facts or if there are factual errors and inaccuracies. Evaluate further the logical structure of the thesis, links among the chapters, and the comprehensibility of the text for a reader.			
Comments: I gave maximal points because I was impressed by the clarity of the work. Each and every step is clearly yet briefly explained. It can be seen that the student knows how to write academic text and also how to prioritise tasks and deliver brief but thorough reports.			
Evaluation criterion:		The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).	
5. Formal level of the thesis		100 (A)	
Criteria description: Assess the correctness of formalisms used in the thesis, the typographical and linguistic aspect s, see Dean's Directive No. 12/2014, Article 3.			
Comments: Again, the quality of the text is impeccable.			
Evaluation criterion:		The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).	
6. Bibliography		90 (A)	
Criteria description: Evaluate the student's activity in acquisition and use of studying materials in his thesis. Characterize the choice of the sources. Discuss whether the student used all relevant sources, or whether he tried to solve problems that were already solved. Verify that all elements taken from other sources are properly differentiated from his own results and contributions. Comment if there was a possible violation of the citation ethics and if the bibliographical references are complete and in compliance with citation standards.			

Comments:

Excellent work with sources, good integration of knowledge.

Evaluation criterion:

The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).

**7. Evaluation of results,
publication outputs and awards**

100 (A)

Criteria description:

Comment on the achieved level of major results of the thesis and indicate whether the main results of the thesis extend published state-of-the-art results and/or bring completely new findings. Assess the quality and functionality of hardware or software solutions. Alternatively, evaluate whether the software or source code that was not created by the student himself was used in accordance with the license terms and copyright. Comment on possible publication output or awards related to the thesis.

Comments:

The results are not new results because the goal is a network management system. However, the results are directly used by the Sinkule hostel (kolej), thus in a real-life environment.

Evaluation criterion:

No evaluation scale.

8. Applicability of the results

Criteria description:

Indicate the potential of using the results of the thesis in practice.

Comments:

The results are not new results because the goal is a network management system. However, the results are directly used by the Sinkule hostel (kolej), thus in a real-life environment.

Evaluation criterion:

No evaluation scale.

9. Questions for the defence

Criteria description:

Formulate any question(s) that the student should answer to the committee during the defence (use a bullet list).

Questions:

I do not have questions. In fact at the end of the project the student made a demonstration of his management system.

Evaluation criterion:

The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).

10. The overall evaluation

100 (A)

Criteria description:

Summarize the parts of the thesis that had major impact on your evaluation. The overall evaluation **does not** have to be the arithmetic mean or any other formula with the values from the previous evaluation criteria 1 to 9.

Comments:

I would say that from the formal perspective this work can be given to any student as a good example as how such a work should be written.

Signature of the reviewer: